

**Citizens Advisory Panel
February 20, 2007
Meeting Summary**

Attendance:

Howard Peak	Dr. Ed Roy	Liza Gonzalez
Gene Dawson Jr.	Steve Green	Ruby Perez
Orlando Cisneros	Evelyn Bonavita	
Susan Albert	Dr. Alan Dutton	
Jerry Green	Eiginio Rodriguez	
Rene Cortez	Tony Navarrete	Luci Cockrell
Richard Araujo	Ben Youngblood	Steven Schauer
Dave Barton	Bob Carter	Susan Wright
Nettie Hinton	Eddie Garcia	Joe Fulton

Excused:

Absent:

SAWS Staff:

Calvin Finch	Stephanie Bocanegra	Doug Leonhard
Michelle Eisenhauer	Rene Gonzalez	
Esther Harrah	Kari Papelbon	

Board Member:

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Howard Peak at 6:00 p.m.

Approval of Minutes

Mr. Peak asked if there were any changes to the minutes. With no changes requested the minutes were approved for the January 9th meeting.

Introduction of Members

Dr. Finch discussed an information session for new members held prior to the February 20th meeting. Dr. Finch provided an introduction for Ms. Liza Gonzalez, a new CAP member unable to attend the February 20th meeting. All present introduced themselves and their roles in the CAP.

Water Resource Committee Update (Dr. Calvin Finch)

Dr. Finch waived the full time for a Water Resource Committee Update in favor of introduction of new members to the CAP as requested by Mr. Howard Peak. Dr. Finch announced that the next Water Resource Committee meeting was scheduled for the next week. Previous meeting's important issue: Helotes mulch pile fire plan. A brief Committee discussion on the mulch fire ensued.

Legislative Update (Dr. Calvin Finch – Presentation)

Dr. Finch provided a presentation which discussed the legislative activities occurring in Austin and the top priority projects for SAWS. Items discussed in the presentation included:

- Activities in Austin
 - SNR and HNR hearing dates and times
 - More than 2000 bills filed through February 16
 - SAWS maintaining a presence among legislators
- SAWS Top Priorities

- Edwards Aquifer Pumping Cap
- Region L Plan
- Design/Build
- Groundwater Conservation Districts
- Conservation
- Environmental Flows
- Edwards Aquifer Pumping Cap
 - HB 1292 filed by Rep. Puente and SB 659 filed by Sen. Wentworth
 - SAWS has submitted language—increase cap, floor of 340,000 ac-ft, Stage 1 at 660ft vs. 665 ft.
 - Continued dialogue with EAA and regional stakeholders
- Region L Plan
 - SB 181 filed by Wentworth—SAWS working with regional partners to ensure passage
- Design/Build
 - SAWS is working with CEC and DBIA on language for HB 477; possible stand-alone bill for San Antonio
- Conservation
 - HB 4—will extend irrigation enforcement into ETJ
 - Amendment to HB 4 under consideration, would require compliance with EPA’s new WaterSense efficiency standards
- Environmental Flows and Reuse
 - HB 3 filed by Rep. Puente—would create advisory groups to advise TCEQ on “scientific” studies regarding flow needs
 - SAWS is working with Rep. Puente to allow more water developer representation
 - Draft reuse bills on indirect reuse circulated by Rep. Callegari
- Key Dates
 - VIVA San Antonio—Feb. 20, Last day to file legislation—Mar. 9, Last day of session—May 28

Comments & Responses:

Mr. Jerry Green asked if a 660-ft Stage 1 entry point had been translated into days, times, or frequency if it was known how much more frequently Stage 1 restrictions would be enacted and if the number of days in restrictions would increase if the entry point changed to 660. Dr. Finch stated that he did not have that information with him, although 660 ft is slightly below the average level of the Edwards Aquifer and SAWS is promoting the idea that San Antonio should not be in restrictions when the aquifer level is at average level or above (660 – 665 average). Mr. Ben Youngblood asked if anything about spring flow triggers was included in the decision to change the Stage 1 entry point to 660 ft. Dr. Finch responded that Comal was still considered but the San Marcos was not. Mr. Youngblood asked if that was one of the consensus issues. Dr. Finch stated that the San Marcos Springs has not been as problematic due to performance last year. Dr. Finch also stated that SAWS is involved in the RIP process and is working to get USGS involved to see the relationships between spring flow and water usage in the rest of the aquifer. Dr. Finch also stated that SAWS priorities are also to protect endangered species and interests downstream. Ms. Evelyn Bonavita stated that she thought the regional planning group had met the TWDB Region L water resource plan deadline, but there were last minute discussions at the time of signing. Mr. Youngblood asked if there were water quality issues involved. Dr. Finch responded that there is a lot of discussion. An example was the Helotes

fire--who is responsible for maintaining the quality of the Edwards Aquifer? In that case, the SAWS Board and EAA took responsibility, but both would like the responsibility clarified in the legislature. Mr. Youngblood asked if a bill was filed or circulated? Dr. Finch responded that there was language discussed in general terms in Austin earlier in the day, but no particular bill has been drafted. This language would probably be incorporated into the Edwards cap bill. Ms. Nettie Hinton asked if the San Antonio, Bexar County, and surrounding county delegations decided not to take on water quality issues this session. Dr. Finch responded that that was not accurate and that a write-up on water quality importance was drafted and is a priority. The EAA and SAWS would like to see clearer local responsibilities, under a TCEQ umbrella. Mr. Howard Peak commented that he appreciates the need for the state to step in, but there is concern with the erosion of our ability to protect local resources, although there are pretty good rules in place. With legislation, the concern is the loss of that ability. Dr. Finch responded that everyone needs clarification on water quality in general, but there is no general agreement on what the language should be. Mr. Gene Dawson asked why SAWS wouldn't just choose to follow the stand-alone bill option. Dr. Finch responded that there is legislation prepared to carve out opportunity for SAWS to operate the new brackish groundwater project. Ms. Esther Harrah added that SAWS is going both routes: working with CEC and DBIA, and SAWS is hoping to get a compromise bill passed to accommodate everyone. Mr. Dawson stated that another concern is that the CEC doesn't represent every engineering firm that might have a concern about this. Therefore, SAWS may find a compromise there and still find legislative problems in the vote as the bill moves forward. He concluded that the City of San Antonio option design build option might be the best way to go.

Regional Carrizo Water Supply Program (Ms. Esther Harrah, P.E. – Presentation)

Dr. Finch gave a brief introduction on the decision to make the Regional Carrizo Project the next benchmarking project as well as the benchmarking process. Ms. Harrah provided a briefing on the Regional Carrizo Water Supply Program project. Issues discussed included:

- Why is SAWS Pursuing Additional Supplies?
 - 1993 Texas Legislature created the EAA and mandated reductions in supplies
 - SAWS has invested millions of dollars in alternative water supply development
 - Recycled Water & Conservation
 - ASR
 - Surface Water
 - Population and regional economic development continue to grow
- Supply & Demand
- Recycled Water
 - 75-mile pipeline to deliver non-potable water
 - Reduces reliance on Edwards Aquifer
 - Provides an uninterrupted supply, safe for industrial use and landscape
- Conservation
- Aquifer Storage & Recovery
 - Injection of treated drinking water from the Edwards Aquifer into the Carrizo Aquifer as an underground storage reservoir
 - Serves as a supply reserve for peak demand periods
 - 30,000 acre-feet storage capacity at the end of Phase II
- Surface Water Supplies
 - Partnered with Guadalupe Blanco River Authority (GBRA) to process and convey water from the GBRA treatment facility at Canyon Lake
 - SAWS' first surface-water supplies brought online in April 2006

- Regional Carrizo Water Supply Program Overview
 - Region L Plan includes a water supply project from the Carrizo Aquifer
 - Strictly a groundwater project
 - Elements include public supply wells, a collection system, pump station, transmission pipelines, and additions to the Twin Oaks Drinking Water Treatment Plant
 - SAWS is leasing water rights
 - 11 monitoring wells in the Sparta, Queen City, and Carrizo Aquifers are currently in place
 - Withdrawal limits are established at one a/f per surface acre per aquifer (Carrizo & Wilcox)
 - All withdrawals are monitored by the Gonzales County Underground Water Conservation District (GCUWCD)
 - Project planned in multiple segments
 - Current estimates of potential production:
 - Phase I—22,600 A/F (Western Gonzales County)
 - Phase II—11,000 A/F (Wilson County)
 - Phase III—22,600 A/F (Eastern Gonzales County)
- Project Location
- Planned Facilities
- What is the Proposed Well Field Configuration?
- Where are the Proposed Transportation Facilities?
- Current Program Status
 - SAWS requested drilling and production permits
 - 14 Carrizo Aquifer production wells for the production and export of 11,687.835 ac-ft
 - 4 Carrizo Aquifer and 2 Queen City monitoring wells
 - Transportation permit to convey water to Bexar County
 - Permit applications were submitted on June 16, 2006 and declared administratively complete on July 14, 2006
- Permit Applications
 - Public Hearings for consideration of drilling, pumping, and transportation permits held on October 10, 2006 and February 15, 2007
 - Contesting Entities—GCUWCD Manager, Schertz-Seguin, Bexar Met, Nixon, Gonzales County Water Company, Smiley, WPA (Water Protection Association), and one private landowner
 - Preparations for public hearings and mediation include technical and legal evaluations
- Leased Area to Date
- Regional Carrizo Water Supply Program Overview
 - SAWS Team Members
 - Black & Veatch—Project Manager, Conceptual Design Study
 - CH2M Hill—Wells and Wellfield
 - HDR—Pump Station
 - LAN—Segment 1
 - Tetra Tech—Segment 2
 - Freese & Nichols—Segment 3
- Will SAWS Mitigate?

- SAWS Board of Trustees adopted a mitigation policy in August 2005
- SAWS will mitigate the effects of water level drawdown in existing wells
- Mitigation measures will be determined using scientific and hydrological data and principles
- Measures include
 - Lowering existing pump to lowered well water level
 - Deepening existing well
 - Drilling new well
 - Connecting landowner to existing potable system, if landowner desires and it is a viable option
- Well Mitigation
- Public Outreach Approach
 - Water Resources and Communications are developing an outreach initiative to involve
 - Cities of Nixon and Smiley
 - Schertz-Seguin Local Government Corporation
 - Bexar Metropolitan Water District
 - Gonzales Water Supply Corporation
 - Wilson County
 - Youth Intern Program
 - Agricultural interests
- Public Outreach Update
 - Currently, staff are initiating meetings with elected officials and contesting parties
 - Communications staff are developing & distributing direct-mail pieces
 - Recent direct-mail piece was mailed the week of February 5, 2007
 - Open house at Nixon office held January 11, 2007
 - SAWS provided project overviews at the 2007 San Antonio Stock Show & Rodeo
 - Open house in Gonzales held February 6, 2007
 - Wilson County Gardening Day held February 11, 2007

Comments & Responses

Mr. Jerry Green asked what the rules are in terms of how to obtain leases. Ms. Harrah responded that she wasn't aware of a law that governs how to obtain leases, but the GCUWCD rules limit the withdrawal of 1 acre-foot per aquifer. Therefore, to pump 22,000 acre-feet you must lease 22,000 surface acres of land. Are you leasing the surface acres? Ms. Harrah responded that SAWS is leasing the water rights. Dr. Finch added that a decision was made on the Carrizo project not to disrupt the tax roles and agricultural community so SAWS is leasing water rights, the nearest you can get to purchasing the water rights, but does not own the land. Mr. Rene Cortez asked how SAWS is protected if the individual property owners sell their land. Ms. Harrah responded that it is recorded as part of the deed so that when they transfer the land, it's part of the contract. Dr. Finch explained how the contract payment process works. Ms. Bonavita asked if the water would be going into the ASR plant. Ms. Harrah responded that it would go to the Twin Oaks facility to be treated, but not stored. Dr. Finch added that the treated water would be the same quality as the Edwards water. Mr. Jerry Green asked how ASR works. Dr. Finch responded that that was not the case. Ms. Susan Albert asked how long the leases were effective. Ms. Harrah responded that they are perpetual and have a built-in matrix to take the CPI and PPI inflation indices into account. Ms. Bonavita commented that residents of the project area are concerned with water quality and quantity. Mr. Howard Peak commented that he assumed there had been studies conducted to show the quantity available versus the amount SAWS plans to

pump. Dr. Finch explained that the model used in the Carrizo Project study has been accepted by TWDB and shows that SAWS will not go over a 100-ft drawdown, but the GCUWCD has accepted another model that reflects a drawdown beyond the 100-ft limit. Mr. Youngblood asked how much of a difference there was between the two models. Dr. Finch responded that the GCUWCD model reflects a 104-120-ft drawdown. Mr. Youngblood asked whether there was great, moderate, or a small vocal opposition in the community. Dr. Finch responded that on the surface there was a relatively large opposition. Mr. Youngblood asked why the project is beneficial to the local community. Dr. Finch responded that the outreach effort is in effect which includes discussing the economic development funds for Nixon and Smiley, leases and jobs, mitigation, and reinforcing the fact that SAWS will follow GCUWCD rules. Dr. Dutton commented that the GCUWCD's 1 acre-ft/ acre production rule is the same number on the Ogallala Aquifer and that there was not any science behind that number - it was just the way it was always done.

Open Discussion (Staff & Committee Members)

Mr. Cortez asked how the Carrizo Aquifer gets recharged. Dr. Ed Roy responded that the Carrizo and Edwards Aquifers are very different because they are different types of aquifers and that the Carrizo recharge will come from the outcrop and surface refiltration. A brief discussion about the depths of the aquifers ensued, with a response that the Carrizo wells are 1500-2000 feet deep. Dr. Finch commented that the aquifers do communicate somewhat, but the estimates show very little communication in the pumping area. Mr. Peak asked if the recharge areas are defined similar to how the Edwards recharge areas are. Ms. Harrah responded that they are. Mr. Eiginio Rodriguez asked if there is a worst drought scenario. Ms. Harrah responded that the model takes into account the 50-year drought for historical data. Mr. Youngblood asked what a realistic picture of the yield to SAWS would be from the Carrizo project. Ms. Harrah responded that the first permit called for 11,600 acre-feet (the amount leased at the time of the permit) and once that was reached the remainder up to 22,600 acre-feet would be obtained. Mr. Youngblood asked what the cost per acre-foot for the project is. Ms. Harrah gave an approximate \$853/acre-foot. Mr. Dawson asked if the \$853 is based on Phase I alone or all Phases. Ms. Bonavita commented that SAWS is not the only entity requesting the Carrizo Aquifer water and that is a concern of the Region L group. Mr. Rodriguez asked if there are any sandstone aquifers that have gone dry due to pumping? Dr. Dutton responded that the Trinity Aquifer is an example to look at because the pressure has been reduced, but the water capacity has not decreased.

Committee Member Requests

Mr. Youngblood would like the exact cost per acre-foot for all Phases. Mr. Jerry Green would like a map of the Carrizo Aquifer.

Citizens to be Heard

Mr. Larry Hoffmann commented on the importance of considering the environment with water projects.

Schedule Next Meeting: March 20, 2007.

Adjournment: With no further business to discuss, the Citizens Advisory Panel Meeting was adjourned at 7:36 p.m. by Mr. Howard Peak.